



COLORADO

Department of
Transportation

**Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
May 29, 2015
9:00 AM – 11:30 AM
CDOT HQ Auditorium, 4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Denver, CO
Agenda**

- 9:00-9:05** **Welcome and Introductions** – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- 9:05-9:10** **Approval of January Meeting Minutes (Pages 2 - 15)** – Vince Rogalski
- 9:10-9:20** **Transportation Commission Report (Informational Update) (Pages 16 - 20)** – Vince Rogalski
- Summary report of the most recent Transportation Commission meeting.
- 9:20-10:00** **TPR Reports (Informational Update)** – STAC Representatives
- Brief update from STAC members on activities in their TPRs.
- 10:00-10:15** **Federal and State Legislative Report (Informational Update)** – Herman Stockinger & Andy Karsian, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations (OPGR)
- Update on recent federal and state legislative activity.
- 10:15-10:25** **Break**
- 10:25-10:45** **Freight Plan (Discussion) (Pages 21)** – Jason Willis, CDOT Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
- Update and discussion on draft State Highway Freight Plan and development of Integrated Freight Plan.
- 10:45-10:55** **Bustang Update (Informational Update)** – Mike Timlin, CDOT Division of Transit & Rail (DTR)
- Update on status of Bustang opening.
- 10:55-11:05** **FY 2016 – 2019 Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) (Informational Update)** – Jamie Collins, CDOT Office of Financial Management and Budget (OFMB)
- Update on the development and adoption of the FY 2016-2019 STIP.
- 11:05-11:25** **GIS Planning Tool (Informational Update)** – Jeff Sudmeier and Gary Aucott, CDOT DTD
- Presentation and demo on transportation planning data to aid in identification of project needs and project development.
- 11:25-11:30** **Other Business-** Vince Rogalski
- 11:30** **Adjourn**

STAC Conference Call Information: 1-877-820-7831 321805#

STAC Website: <http://www.coloradodot.info/programs/statewide-planning/stac.html>

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2015**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: April 24, 9:00 a.m.-11:30 a.m.

Chairman: Thad Noll (for Vince Rogalski)

Attendance:

In Person – Thad Noll (IM), Pete Baier (GVMPO), Kevin Hall (SW), Scott Hobson (PACOG), Norm Steen (PPACG), Andy Pico (PPACG), Craig Casper (PPACG), Doug Rex (DRCOG), Elise Jones (DRCOG), George Wilkinson (SLV), Barbara Kirkmeyer (UFR), Sean Conway (NFRMPO), Rodney Class-Erickson (SUIT), Gary Beedy (EA), Pete Fraser (SC), Mack Loudon (SC), Chuck Grobe (NW), Jim Baldwin (SE), Stephanie Gonzales (SE).

By Phone – Buffie McFadyen (PACOG).

Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
<p>Introductions / March Minutes / Thad Noll</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of March STAC Minutes 	<p>Minutes approved.</p>
<p>Transportation Commission Report / Thad Noll</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thad Noll discussed the most recent TC meeting. Last meeting included opportunity for public comment on the STIP – no comments received. TC passed a resolution to approve a new Scenic Byway called Tracks Across Borders which runs from Durango to Chama, NM and passes through the Southern Ute Reservation. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>TPR Reports/ STAC Members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Grand Valley</u>: Held an open house on corridor in the RTP which was well attended and the project is moving forward; ribbon cutting occurred on biogas operation to fuel trash trucks, buses, etc. that should save \$200,000 a year within two years as the fleet is converted; Mark Imhoff attended opening for west transit facility that will improve service in the valley. <u>Southwest</u>: Not much to report; last TPR meeting was spent talking about STAC and TC; Stand Up for Transportation event was held in Durango with good media coverage; RAMP project in Durango continuing with good weather. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>PACOG</u>: Approved the FY16 - FY19 TIP at yesterday's meeting; 3 projects currently in construction: US 50 eastbound lane, improvements to SH 7, and Dillon Interchange; CDOT hosted an open house for the I-25 ILEX project with 130 in attendance; Pueblo held a Stand Up For Transportation event with good media coverage but not so many attendees. • <u>PPACG</u>: Currently working on TIP amendments; two new staff members recently hired; COG is monitoring current legislation such as TRANS II, which CCI is supporting; also watching TABOR refund bill. • <u>DRCOG</u>: Celebrated its 60th anniversary with a big event attended by Governor Hickenlooper and Executive Director Bhatt; approved the TIP at April Board Meeting; continuing to work on Metro Vision with planned adoption in the summer; staff is also working on unified planning work program. • <u>San Luis Valley</u>: No meeting held since last STAC; starting to get some projects going and gearing up for construction season, with Trout Creek Pass being the largest project on the agenda. • <u>Upper Front Range</u>: No meeting held since last STAC; as previously mentioned UFR completed the first RAMP project and conditionally approved the RTP pending freight revisions; waiting on FHWA to approve Buy America waiver to buy more CNG vehicles using CMAQ funds; held North I-25 Coalition meeting attended by Congressman Jared Polis, who is very supportive of the projects in the area. • <u>North Front Range</u>: No meeting held in April; will be hosting a Transportation Summit on June 15th from 8:00 to 1:30 at Island Grove Park in Greeley, free event that includes breakfast and lunch and will feature a keynote by Senator Cory Gardner (with Governor Hickenlooper also invited), expecting some great speakers lined up and hoping for some interesting transportation solutions. • <u>Southern Ute Indian Tribe</u>: Three major projects on the SR 172 Ignacio Corridor, all are La Plata County / City of Ignacio / SUIT Tribal collaborations, all three are in design, under construction, or complete; Tribe is updating their LRTP and developing a new Tribal Safety Plan, hoping that these will result in additional collaboration in Southwest Colorado. 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Eastern</u>: Discussed funding at last meeting, hoping to maintain the local system and get some new construction; rest area issue is still being examined to determine how it will affect the Region 4 budget. • <u>South Central</u>: Pete Frasier has received inquiries about crews being pulled off of certain projects and put on new ones with the per diem charged to the original project, hoping someone at CDOT can check on that; staying on course with regional TPR meetings; transit is being very quick with the grants and starting to become inundated with them; starting on FY2016 – FY2019 STIP items as some money is available early; Pete Frasier’s projected retirement date is July 31st, beginning to search for replacement and would like to gauge interest in a meeting of rural TPRs to help bring new staff up to speed. • <u>Northwest</u>: Approved the RTP at last meeting; SH 9 project just started and delays will be minimal for the next three weeks but increase to 30 minutes during the summer; the resurfacing of Berthoud Pass will start in May and create other delays in the area. • <u>Southeast</u>: Grenada Bridge US 50 Overpass project is underway, Las Animas Safe Routes project is starting next month, Lamar Downtown Design Plan is still being completed, the Haswell project is getting underway next week; the next TPR meeting is set for June 24th; an Open House with Senator Bennett will be held in Lamar as well. • <u>Intermountain</u>: Last TPR meeting was canceled; Summit County and Grand County are working together to maintain detour routes in relation to the aforementioned SH 9 and Berthoud Pass projects; the SH 9 project further south is finishing up after two years, now doing final re-vegetation; looking for FOR on SH 9 RAMP project by next week so we can move forward; CNG meeting with Copper Mountain in the next few weeks to see about putting in a station on I-70. 	
<p>CDOT Organizational Update / Herman Stockinger</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As requested at the last STAC meeting, an updated CDOT organizational chart is included in the packet. • The Director of Highway Maintenance was formerly under the Chief Engineer but is now under the Chief Operating Officer. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This was the only item affected by the recent legislation. • Another change is that DTD and DTR are now under the Chief Engineer. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>STAC COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: How does the Division of Highway Maintenance interact with the RTDs? • <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: Is there an RTD that would like to answer that? • <u>Johnny Olson</u>: Scott Cuthbertson is our direct supervisor and we meet monthly to coordinate with him. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: If you have issues with maintenance in the region do you have to go through his division to get help with them? • <u>Johnny Olson</u>: We deal with day-to-day maintenance issues at the regional level. We only go up to the Division of Highway Maintenance for budgetary issues. • <u>Karen Rowe</u>: Maintenance staff in each region still report directly to the RTD. 	
<p>State and Federal Legislative Update / Herman Stockinger</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are expecting a new federal authorization bill within the month. There is a lot of interest in using repatriated funds as a short-term funding solution, but not much interest in raising new transportation revenue at this time. • Both Georgia and Idaho have taken steps to increase transportation funding. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Georgia is instituting a hotel fee, a weight tax on trucks, and changing the gas sales tax to an excise tax. Combined these are estimated to produce \$900 million extra per year. ○ Idaho is raising its gas tax by 7 cents. • Solutions are also being sought in Colorado. One is Governor Hickenlooper’s Five Point Plan that would ensure SB228 transfers. The other is the TRANS Bonds II Proposal. CDOT supports the Governor’s proposal but not TRANS Bonds II. Regardless of the proposals, what we should care about most is that the Legislature is talking about transportation issues. • Not sure if TRANS Bonds II will make it out of the House or if the Governor’s proposal will gain support, but there’s still time for something positive to happen before the end of the legislative session. <p>STAC COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sean Conway</u>: – I have a comment about what’s going on in Arizona – the tax credit bill. It’s not a traditional approach to raising revenue. 	<p>Vote on motion to table TRANS Bonds II discussion and vote until more information is available.</p> <p>Motion Passes 9-5.</p>

	<p>Representatives from Arizona will be at our upcoming summit and they are leaders in transportation funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Thad Noll</u>: Did people want to discuss and possibly vote on the TRANs Bonds II proposal? • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: The STAC supported TRANs Bonds I in 1999 – I think that as people who understand the transportation system in Colorado and care about the condition of the economy, we should be in support. • <u>Kevin Hall</u>: Could we get a summary of what it involves? • <u>Thad Noll</u>: Essentially it is a re-do of TRANs Bonds I. The debt service on those bonds are almost paid off, so the question is whether we should renew that and use future maintenance funds for bonding. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: As was the case before, ½ of CDOT’s expected federal funding would be used to bond \$3.5 billion in new projects. The legislation would put a request to allow bonding on the November ballot for voters to approve. The list of projects associated with TRANs Bonds II is based on CDOT’s SB 228 list, with some revisions. • <u>Sean Conway</u>: The bill will be in front of the Senate next week. It allows the voters to weigh in on the discussion – we’ve had the SB 228 plan for a while but no money for it. Any opportunity to educate the voters is something we should do. Most constituents don’t have a good understanding of these issues. In a statewide survey presented to the Legislature yesterday, results showed that there is no appetite for a tax increase, and other funding sources also poll poorly, but this idea polls well. • <u>Elise Jones</u>: This doesn’t ultimately solve the problem because it doesn’t create any new revenue. If you go to the voters with a solution that doesn’t resolve the problem then you can’t go back later, they won’t bite the apple twice. This proposal takes almost \$500 million away from maintenance that we’re counting on for the future, while adding new capacity that we also don’t have money to maintain. We need to generate new revenues for transportation moving forward. • <u>Pete Fraser</u>: What do you mean it will use future CDOT maintenance dollars? • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: The money for bonding would come from existing funds for surface treatment, capital maintenance, etc. It would not impact road crews, snow & ice removal, etc. • <u>Pete Fraser</u>: How much would the debt service be? 	
--	--	--

- Debra Perkins-Smith: Roughly \$170m per year – currently these are targeted at system maintenance but would be reduced to pay for debt service.
- Peter Baier: Our TPR is in full support – the logic is that any money that goes to transportation is good. We don't disagree that a revenue solution is needed. Would any of the TRANS I projects be complete today without that bonding? It's not a bad idea to let the voters decide.
- Thad Noll: We are strongly against it – we already have a giant deficit in capital maintenance – to build more capacity that requires even more maintenance dollars when we can't pay for what we already have feels like a Ponzi Scheme. There need to be new dollars or a funding backfill to CDOT. In 1999, when TRANS Bonds I passed, we had never felt the effects of TABOR. We had the idea then that maintenance dollars would continue to grow, but now we know that that's not true with TABOR. People like the notion of saying yes to new projects, but may not understand all the implications of taking money away from maintaining the existing system.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: If maintenance is such a big issue, why didn't we focus more on that with RAMP? It's not all capacity – there are transit projects, maintenance projects, etc. I don't believe that we're going to have no maintenance money in the future.
- Sean Conway: We're at record low interest rates that aren't likely to stay. Your concerns are valid, but the issue is that in 1999 we came together. Northern Colorado's economy is at risk and I-25 N has been ignored for 40 years – under current plans a widening is not scheduled until 2075. It's up to the voters to decide – if it fails it fails, but you can't deny the voters the opportunity.
- Norm Steen: The CCI recommendation was to support the bill, but without a specific list of projects. Has that been done?
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: I think that the bill doesn't have a specific list associated with it – they're trying to gain support via edits to the eventual list.
- Elise Jones: If this body is interested in weighing in on a bill that produces new revenues, then the Governor's Five Point Plan is a better avenue for that by shaking loose the SB 228 funds.
- Pete Fraser: What would the interest rate be?
- Sean Conway: It would depend on the rate at the time of approval.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: I would like to propose a motion to support TRANS Bonds II, but without a project list. • <u>Elise Jones</u>: To clarify, the bill does include a project list. • <u>Andy Pico</u>: You're raiding maintenance funds to get more money in the short-term. It's a trap! You're creating a big wave of maintenance projects downstream. We're going through that now and it's not a good idea. • <u>Kevin Hall</u>: I have a procedural objection since this is not on the agenda and we have no background material available. I have no confidence in making a recommendation on behalf of five counties with no information. • <u>Thad Noll</u>: What do we do? I have the same concerns. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: That's not true, we can add something to the agenda if we choose to. • <u>Elise Jones</u>: I would like to make a substitute motion to table this until we have time to consider and discuss. • <u>Thad Noll</u>: We will take the substitute motion first. • <u>Sean Conway</u>: The timeline for the Legislature is short, so if we don't get involved now it will be over before we can weigh in. Voting in favor of the concept gets us at the table for the next 12 days. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: The original motion was not to support the bill or support the list, but to support the concept of this as a potential solution. If we do that then we can weigh in on the issue with the Legislature. • <u>Elise Jones</u>: I am still in favor of tabling, because the 12 day period is so short that I don't think we even have a way to be involved as a group anyway. • Vote on Motion to Table the Discussion – The Ayes Have It – Tabled (9-5 in favor) 	
<p>Governor's Working Group on Resiliency / Debra Perkins-Smith</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Johnny Olson</u>: The Colorado Resiliency Working Group will post a draft on its statewide framework (high level, strategic) for public comments on the Colorado United Website. We will email it to the group on Monday or Tuesday of next week. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
	<p>BREAK</p>	

<p>Introduction to CDOT Executive Director / Shailen Bhatt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First time at STAC and I'm excited to be here. • I have been on the job for about 75 days and starting to learn. Trying to listen and learn and lead all at the same time. Coming from the outside you have some disadvantages, but you also come in with fresh eyes. You can tell a lot about an organization by the way they keep the equipment in the yard. You can tell a lot about a state by the condition of their highways. Driving on I-70 and I-25 you see some issues with the condition, and that doesn't even touch on the capacity issues. • The Department is great and has a lot of great people. Also a great partnership with FHWA. I'm excited that people are having a legitimate conversation on transportation issues in this state, be it TRANs Bonds II or the Governor's Five Point Plan. Our job is to help guide that conversation to help the political folks make the right decisions. I think the job of the DOT is economic development and safety. My goal is to make CDOT the #1 DOT in the US. We have the right people in place, we just need some money. <p>STAC COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Craig Casper</u>: Prior to the last occupant, the attendance of the Executive Director was monthly at the STAC. Executive Director Hunt attended I think twice. Will you be a more regular presence here? • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: I'll tell you in 10 minutes. Seriously, I think that my job is to make sure I am listening to the organizations that you represent. So to the extent that it's practical I want to be here. • <u>Gary Beedy</u>: The rural parts of the state are less populous but very important economically. Surrounding states have 4-lane roads coming into Colorado. We finally got a Super Two on US 287. Something the state needs to look at is offering an alternative to the freight traffic on I-25 via more capacity when people arrive in Colorado, so they don't have to stay only on the Front Range. • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: The rural-urban divide is not unique to Colorado. We as a DOT need to recognize the importance of the rural parts of the state. Rural folks also need to recognize the goods and commerce flowing in the interstates and urban areas. We need a regional conversation because you're only as strong as your weakest link. It really comes down to money – we need more of it and I would love for you to have a 4-lane but we need to decide where the limited funds go. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Kevin Hall</u>: Thank you for coming down to visit Region 5. The staff there from Kerri on downward are great and I want you to know that. • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: Thank you, it says something to hear about how good CDOT staff are. Government is a monopoly but shouldn't behave that way – we need to focus on customer service. • <u>Peter Baier</u>: I agree with your economic development and safety focus for the DOT. • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: We are in an economic competition with the entire world. We have to consider why someone wouldn't want to locate a company here in Colorado. It's a great state, the mountains look like paradise, but if I can't get there then that will factor into the decision about where to locate. I don't say this lightly – we are at a critical juncture between being a region that continues to prosper and one like Dallas that chokes on its own growth. • <u>Elise Jones</u>: I've lost track of the number of events that I've seen you at in the last 75 days. People really appreciate that you're taking the time to visit and listen. • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: I think that a big part of this job is to get out and listen to people, not just come to them when you need help. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: – What is your vision for Colorado so that we don't become like Dallas? • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: I don't think that you ever build your way out of congestion. On US 36 we're adding a lane but we'll still have congestion. We're adding Peak Period Shoulder Lanes on I-70 and we'll still have a congestion. We can add a lane on I-25, that's the big thing in TRANs Bonds II, but we'll still have congestion. We are using a 20th century approach on a 21st century problem. I am not an anti-construction person, but we're at a point where technology is accelerating so quickly that we need to recognize it. I think there is a leap that is about to occur and I want to make Colorado a test bed for this quantum leap so we can lead the way. An example: everyone says that you need 12-foot lanes everywhere, but what if we have connected vehicles that don't need that much space? Are we at peak road right now? Can we shrink the footprint? We're not going to win the lane arms race with Utah, even with more money, but can we beat them by being more innovative? • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: I would like to know how you see that playing into the movement of goods, because that's very important for our economy. 	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: Another example: I was in Germany and saw on the Autobahn, they had freight trucks in a caravan 6-inches apart, all controlled by the lead vehicle. It takes up much less real estate and boosts efficiency. Another potential application would be having sensors in the wheels of cars going up Floyd Hill showing when traction control kicks in so we know when to apply salt. Safety is the big concern with new technologies of course, but the existing system kills 30,000 people nationwide and 500 in Colorado each year. 80% of those are based on human error, so technology could potentially be a game changer there. • <u>Norn Steen</u>: Broadband is an emerging economic issue nationwide and CDOT owns a lot of fiber that local municipalities don't have access to. That's something we need to look at. • <u>Shailen Bhatt</u>: That could also be a revenue source. Our Right of Way more generally is extremely desirable, and we need to see how we can work with folks on using that to its maximum advantage. 	
TIGER VII Grants / Ron Papsdorf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to whoever put me on right after ED Bhatt - he's hard to follow. • On April 16th, the TC endorsed the three proposed CDOT submissions to TIGER VII: I-25 Bus-on-Shoulder, I-70, and Vail Simba Run. • The NOFA has been released for this round – pre-applications must be submitted by May 4th, 2015. Ron Papsdorf (ron.papsdorf@state.co.us) is a willing resource for anyone that is interested and needs support. FHWA also a good resource at www.dot.gov/tiger. <p>STAC COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Elise Jones</u>: We discussed last time the potential to prioritize the three recommended projects. Are we still planning to do so? • <u>Ron Papsdorf</u>: We have heard that US DOT likes prioritization and that it may be an advantage. We may ask the TC to do that in the future, but we are still finalizing some details at this time. We are pretty sure we'll submit the two I-70 projects, whereas I-25 has some outstanding issues that we need to work out before ultimately deciding. There are a few potentially significant pinch points on the roadway to contend with – the solution may be as simple as restriping or as complex as significant bridge work, which would add significant cost to the project. Not ready yet to say whether we're prepared enough on the I-25 project to make it competitive. 	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Doug Rex</u>: You mentioned previously that CDOT may submit a letter of support for locally-submitted applications – what are the criteria for that? • <u>Ron Papsdorf</u>: We would look at them case-by-case as to whether they support the overall statewide goals. We've heard from US DOT in the past that Colorado has not done as well as we could have because there were too many projects in the pot and no clear sense of priority for them. Our goal is maximize our results, wherever the project comes from. • <u>Peter Baier</u>: If this is TIGER VII, can we expect a TIGER VIII? If so, any project that doesn't make it this time could be ready in time for the next. • <u>Jon Cater</u>: We expect that there will be future rounds. • <u>Ron Papsdorf</u>: We are hoping that any potential reauthorization at the federal level would continue the TIGER program and significantly expand the funding. If I-25 Bus-on-Shoulder isn't ready for this round we would hope to submit it next year. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: Do we know in terms of all the TIGER rounds, what percentage of the money we've received? Why are we supportive of TIGER if we don't do well with it? • <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: We would prefer formula funds to TIGER, but TIGER is better for us than the old earmark system given the junior nature of our state's Congressional delegation. But you are right that currently we are not getting what we should, based on our percentage of the overall population. 	
State Highway Freight Plan / Debra Perkins-Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jason Wallis is not available this month – he's on annual leave and looking at freight policies in Europe as part of his graduate studies. • We're here today looking for some input on the status of Phase I and how you want to proceed with Phase II. • We received comments from DRCOG, PPACG, Grand Valley, and FHWA. We plan to compile a response to those comments and share with the group in May. We'll talk now about some key themes that we heard in the comments. John, can you talk about how the freight plan relates to MAP 21? • <u>Jon Cater</u>: FHWA doesn't approve the freight plan – we just verify that it is in accordance with MAP 21. Phase I looks at the highway system, while Phase II will put all the modes together. MAP 21 talks about an increased federal share for freight projects that's available to those states that complete a freight plan. This doesn't mean more money coming to 	No action taken.

Colorado – you would potentially get a 90% match rather than 82%, but you would still have the same amount of money overall, you're just burning through it faster. It's a useful tool for freight projects but not new money.

- Some other general themes: with the list of potential project areas, FHWA recommended being less specific with those and, talking at a corridor or program level to increase flexibility down the road. We discussed whether that list is static once we complete it, and the answer is no, we could review and update it annually. We also heard some questions about Off-System roads and intermodal connectors and the inclusion of NHS facilities that are not on the State System. We recommend saving that discussion for Phase II. Another suggestion was made to more clearly link the Statewide Plan and RTPs to the freight plan and highlight that connection.
- The Transportation Commission will have a presentation and workshop next month that incorporates these comments.
- Elise Jones: What's the deadline for comments?
- Jeff Sudmeier: We're trying to get STAC another draft next month and also prepare for the TC, so getting all comments by the end of next week would help us do that.
- As requested last month, we've also brought an overview of past planning participants (FAC and otherwise) who might be potential stakeholders that we want to approach for participation in Phase II. We'd like to know whether STAC has additional people to consider and how would STAC like to participate in the FAC and Phase II more generally.

STAC COMMENTS

Sean Conway: US DOT has national freight corridors. I think the only one in Colorado is I-25 North. Is that right?

Jon Cater: That system is hamstrung because it's limited to 27,000 miles nationwide, which is not even enough to cover the interstates. We're holding back on national freight corridors as we try to get a fix for that limitation. It's in draft format now. We are hoping they will fix it.

Sean Conway: But there will be a higher priority on freight in the next federal authorization?

Jon Cater: There are competing proposals right now but I think that we will see an emphasis on freight. The issue is that they need to define a network, and right now that part of it is broken. We're waiting on that to get fixed.

	<p><u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: There is some pushback from western states on this to get a solution.</p> <p><u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: What is the plan in regards to the FAC? When will it start? I think there should be STAC participation and I don't know why it would be limited to just a few representatives.</p> <p><u>Thad Noll</u>: That's what we're soliciting ideas for next month. Should we form a sub-committee, have direct participation, etc.</p> <p><u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: I think we should actually be on the committee, not part of a sub-committee. In May we'll discuss the FAC and then we won't get started until after that. I think it's taking too long. Whoever wants to be on the FAC should be on there.</p> <p><u>Thad Noll</u>: So if you want to be on the FAC, email Tim Kirby.</p> <p><u>Craig Casper</u>: Is the TC going to be adopting this? When?</p> <p><u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: No, the TC will not adopt anything.</p> <p><u>Craig Casper</u>: We haven't been involved in the State Highway Safety Plan, the Freight Plan, etc. Are there any others in the works right now that we should know about? TSMO?</p> <p><u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: TSMO is working on corridor plans now.</p> <p><u>Craig Casper</u>: Can we be involved in the ones for our region?</p> <p><u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: They're working on the Mountain Corridor right now.</p> <p><u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Lisa Streisfeld is working on TSMO plans now so she'll be handing the coordination with regional partners.</p>	
Draft FY 2016 – FY 2019 STIP / Jamie Collins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held a public hearing with the TC last week – no public comments received there. • A few comments received via email from MPOs and TPRs, mostly technical corrections. • Public Comment period closes May 8. • Going back to TC in May with summary of comments and changes. • Asking TC to adopt STIP in May. • Will hand off to FHWA and FTA in time for official STIP to begin on July 1st. 	No action taken.
Bustang Opening Day / Mark Imhoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service will begin July 13th (Monday after Independence Day). • Starting to advertise and publicize, things are coming together very well. • As noted at previous STAC, the operating company was sold but we are pleased with the new owners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They are hiring and training drivers as we speak. ○ Driving around town to train drivers and identify warranty issues. 	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently working on some Access Agreements with local entities – working towards final review. • Harmony Road Park-n-Ride is still a moving target – City of Ft. Collins is offering to work with CDOT on parking enforcement via an IGA. • Communications, PR, and Outreach Plan will get started around Memorial Day to lead up to the opening. <p>STAC COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Sean Conway</u>: I talked with a representative from Loveland and they're not aware of what's going on related to the Park-n-Ride, so you might want to circle back with them. Also, how can you have a start date if you haven't reached an agreement with the City of Ft. Collins? • <u>Mark Imhoff</u>: We are working with them in good faith to have it settled before the start date, but if that doesn't occur then we can still begin service, just without parking enforcement. • <u>Norm Steen</u>: You said before that we'll be monitoring ridership and fare box recovery over time to see if adjustments are needed. What are the decision points for that? • <u>Mark Imhoff</u>: We'll be monitoring daily and making at least yearly assessments to see if we're on track. If we're filling buses then we'll need to buy more, and the fare box recovery will allow that, but you need some lead time. • <u>Norm Steen</u>: Currently the route between Colorado Springs and Denver is a Denver-bound commute, not the other way. When would we potentially add a route in the other direction? • <u>Mark Imhoff</u>: It would depend on the ridership and demand. It would probably require additional buses, so we'll have to assess based on the existing routes. 	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reminder that the Statewide MPO Meeting will be held at 1:00 PM in Room 225. 	No action taken.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADJOURN 	

Transportation Commission May 20-21, 2015

Wednesday, May 20, 2015

Please see <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/current-agenda-and-supporting-documents/may-2015-tc-meeting-and-workshops.pdf> for the May 2015 Transportation Commission (TC) Packet.

Program Management Workshop (Richard Zamora, Josh Laipply, Maria Sobota)

Purpose: Update on Program Management reporting.

Action: No action requested.

- This month there is a focus on the Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships (RAMP) Partnership and Operations, and Safety Programs.
- The cash balance is approximately \$1,190.9 million, \$263.0 million above the target. Cash decreased compared to same time last year, but is not currently decreasing at the rate set by our target.
- The cash plus cash equivalents balance is approximately \$1,488.8 million, \$64.6 million over the target. This balance is now closer to our normal expectations for this time of year.
- Expenditure Performance Index (XPI) remained at 0.79.
- The SPI for Flood is at 0.92, and the RAMP Partnership and Operations program has improved to 0.99 from a 0.93 last month.
- The Chief Engineer and Chief Financial Officer have made it a priority that all RAMP partnership projects be managed so that scope and project costs do not exceed their original TC approved project amounts. Region 3 has a RAMP Partnership project that is requesting additional Contingency RAMP Reserve funds. See TC Packet for more details.
- The Safety program focuses on projects with HSIP and FASTER funds.
- See the corresponding Program Management slide in the TC Packet for more details on the Program Management Office Overview by Program on pdf page 10 of the TC Packet.

CDOT Headquarters (HQ)/R1/R2 Relocation Funding Workshop (Maria Sobota)

Purpose: Update on process of evaluating locations and creating budget estimates for relocating the CDOT HQ Campus, the Region 1 HQ Campus and the Region 2 HQ Campus.

Action: No action requested.

Staff have engaged Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) as Real Estate Broker for the Headquarters/Region 1 Project. CBRE has been engaged as the real estate brokerage firm to represent CDOT on the Region 2 Project. H+L Architecture has been engaged to complete programming and test fits for the Headquarters/Region 1 Project. Together with the consultant teams, staff have created an objective scorecard to evaluate each site option. Due diligence is currently being completed on the short listed sites for both projects. The project budgets listed below are intended to represent the highest potential project costs. CDOT is targeting occupancy of all buildings involved in both projects by August, 2017. Budgets are: \$90 million for HQ and Region 1, and \$35 million for Region 2.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to evaluate sites and refine project budgets over the course of the next month. Staff will return to TC to request a project funding resolution in June, 2015.

Discussion and Comments

- Region 4 facility is currently under construction and should be complete within one year.
- Region 2 has five sites currently under consideration with a max cost of \$35 million.

MAY 2015 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

- Important to align workforce, real estate, and finance markets in selecting a new HQ/Region 1 site.
- Commissioners urged staff to be thoughtful and not rush into a decision, but recognize the need to take advantage of current real estate climate to maximize return on investments.
- Commission is concerned about the politics of spending money on facilities, while CDOT is short on funds for projects.
- The Executive Director noted that it is not generally politically popular to invest in building infrastructure, but it needs to be done nonetheless. This is a data driven process, not political.
- A consultant noted that the current facility is not viable for a 21st century workforce. The team is looking for sites across the Denver metro area, and have identified four contenders and are using a scorecard to rate and compare them. Some elements include proximity to transit, walkability, access to retail, development timing, and complexity of transaction.
- Consultant is planning to hold an Executive Session (i.e. non-public) meeting in June with CDOT to discuss budget approval. Site selection is anticipated to occur by the August TC meeting. Construction would start in January 2016. Anticipated move in by summer 2017.
- Commissioners expressed concern related to the speed of timetable, new TC members coming on board, and the lack of detailed information currently available. This effort will require a "Board Level" presentation with 40-50 page memo outlining costs, risks, analysis etc. plus sufficient time to study and consider.
- Questions raised included: Is there potential to bundle financing with other facilities projects? Is paying in cash an option?
- Commissioners have decided to convene in June to review available information, develop consensus, and potentially move forward if comfortable. If not, more time to consider options will be required.

Policy Directive 703.0 Workshop (Maria Sobota, Heidi Humphreys, David Fox)

Purpose: Review recommended updates to the appendices of Policy Directive (PD) 703.0 Annual Budget, Project Budgeting and Cash Management Principles.

Action: TC approval/adoption at regular meeting this month regarding the suggested revisions to the appendices (matrix) of PD 703.0. This information was brought to TC Workshop last month for comment and discussion.

See TC May packet for details on specific changes to PD 703.0 Annual Budget appendices.

Discussion and Comments

The TC generally expressed support for the recommended changes, except for a few minor changes. Approved and adopted during regular TC meeting.

SH 6 Devolution Workshop (Maria Sobota, Dave Eller)

Purpose: Updates on the potential devolution of US 6 between Gypsum and Eagle. Region 3 is asking the TC to provide guidance if this devolution proposal should be pursued further, and if so, what financial parameters should be considered.

Action: CDOT Region 3 Staff requests the TC review and consider the devolution of US 6 between Gypsum and Eagle.

The following items have been identified that may benefit CDOT by reducing:

- Future maintenance, engineering and specialty unit staff commitments to the corridor
- CDOT future financial responsibilities for projects not identified in our asset management programs (i.e., corridor capacity improvement projects in the Towns of Gypsum and Eagle)
- CDOT's assets by eliminating 3 bridges, 3 major drainage structures, 3 traffic signals, 194,000 sf of pavement, and an overhead railroad structure with vertical height restrictions.

The communities have suggested a \$13.1 net present value payment is appropriate. The \$13.1 million appears reasonable considering several projects within the corridor have not been included in the current net present value (NPV) worksheets. The devolution of the roadway segments would significantly reduce the amount of CDOT responsibility and financial participation.

See TC Packet for more details regarding the devolution.

Discussion and Comments

The Region 3 Regional Transportation Director asked if the Transportation Commissioners in attendance:

- Would authorize Region 3 to move forward on negotiations and report back in June;
- Wanted more information prior to review in June; or
- Are not interested in pursuing the devolution at this time.

The Commissioners authorized Region 3 to move forward with negotiations, agreeing that the characteristics of SH 6 between Gypsum and Eagle is more of a local roadway than a state highway.

Thursday, May 21, 2015**Audience Participation**

Several individuals participated during this segment of the TC Regular Meeting. All were comments on the Southwest Chief and the TIGER VII Grant. The TIGER VII Grant is proposed to use \$1 million of transit funds from SB228 to contribute to the match for a TIGER Grant to fund improvements on the AMTRAK Southwest Chief line.

- Senator Larry Crowder, who represents the citizens of Senate District 35 in Southern Colorado, provided testimony in support of providing matching funds for the TIGER application.
- Elena Wilken, Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA) Director, voiced her opposition of using SB228 transit funds for match. Transit needs in Colorado range from \$13-15 million and this \$1 million would have a substantial impact on making other transit improvements in Colorado.
- Nine other individuals participated and voiced their support for the approval of matching funds for the AMTRAK Southwest Chief TIGER application.

Individual Commissioner Comments

Commissioners commented on the following topics and expressed appreciation and/or support for the following campaigns, events, and/or projects:

- Expressed condolences regarding the loss of the Region 5 CDOT employee, David Morris.
- Look to Utah to see how that state has made major investments in transportation.
- Recognition and thank you to Commissioners who will be leaving the TC this summer – Commissioners Barry, Gruen, and Aden.
- Thank you to all the people who came to testify.
- Support and opposition to considering increasing speed limits
- Ground breaking of SH 9 project was mentioned as a successful public private partnership (P3)
- There is no such thing as free transportation – toll lanes improve travel for those who pay and for those in general purpose lanes – a win/win situation.
- Next TC meeting to occur in Grand Junction.

Executive Director's Report (Shailen Bhatt)

- Utah transportation investments are comparatively large, and are an economic benefit to that state – transportation in Colorado is not a nicety, but a necessity.
- Thank you to those who came to testify today.
- Competitiveness regarding TIGER VII funds; \$60 million of Colorado submittals, but there is only \$500 million nationally available.
- Recognition of dedication of employee – Anthony Chavez.
- Congratulated the Division of Administrative Services team for getting all but five of approximately 3,300 employees to enroll for benefits with their successful campaign.
- Service for Dave Morris is tomorrow in Poncha Springs, and there will be a moment of silence tomorrow, May 22 at the time the accident occurred; Helping Hands is collecting donations for the family.
- Orange pins remind us to keep in mind what is truly important.

Chief Engineer's Report (Josh Laipply)

- Add dates are now on track at a two-month lag.
- Welcome to new Deputy Director, Mike Lewis.
- I-70 East Project Manager is Tony Devito.
- Region 1 is now looking for a Regional Transportation Director.

HPTE Director's Report (Mike Cheroutes)

- High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) Board took action to determine city toll rates for US 36. Rates range from \$2 to \$7.75 – 88th Avenue to Denver, which is less than 0.50 cents per mile and is competitive nationally.
- A ceremony will occur on June 22, 2015 at the First Bank Center in Broomfield.
- Construction for toll lanes is complete; toll lanes on US 36 will be operational in July.

FHWA Division Administrator's Report (John Cater)

- ET-Plus Guard Rails – Questions have been raised about whether the ET-Plus guardrail end terminal satisfies applicable safety criteria and performs as intended in the field.
- FHWA is conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the safety performance of the ET-Plus to answer these questions.
- FHWA will be establishing new criteria for this and will increase crash lab testing and documentation requirements for guardrail hardware.

MAY 2015 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS

- A visit to Washington State will occur to see how Washington State operates toll collections, etc. FHWA and CDOT representatives will be traveling to Washington State soon.
- A two-month extension of MAP-21 is anticipated.

Act on Consent Agenda

- Resolution to Approve the **Regular Meeting Minutes of April 16, 2015** (Herman Stockinger) – Approved unanimously with one minor correction on May 22, 2015.
- Discuss and **Act on Southwest Chief TIGER VII Matching Funds** (Mark Imhoff) – Unanimously approved on May 22, 2015 with amendment to **fund from contingency vs. SB228**.
- Discuss and Act on **FY 2016 STIP Approval** (Maria Sobota) – Unanimously approved on May 22, 2015; FHWA to receive adopted STIP for final approval.
- Discuss and Act on **Transfer of CDOT Assets to Bridge Enterprise** (Maria Sobota) – Unanimously passed on May 22, 2015.
- Discuss and Act on the **11th Supplement to the FY 2015 Budget** (Maria Sobota) – Unanimously approved on May 22, 2015.
- Discuss and Act on Approving **Revisions to the PD 703.0 Matrix** (Maria Sobota) – Unanimously approved on May 22, 2015.

Nomination Selection Committee

Three Commissioners were identified to serve on the TC nomination selection committee for TC members leaving after FY 2015. The three Commissioners identified were:

- Zink
- Hofmeister
- Gifford

Announcement

- Kurt Morrison was recently promoted to Director of Legislative Affairs by Governor Hickenlooper.
- Recognized moment of silence for David Morris.

See <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/current-agenda-and-supporting-documents/may-2015-tc-meeting-and-workshops.pdf> for the TC May 2015 Packet.



DATE: May 22, 2015
TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
FROM: Debra Perkins-Smith, Director, Division of Transportation Development
SUBJECT: Revised Draft State Highway Freight Plan and Development of the Integrated Freight Plan

Purpose

This memo provides a link to the revised Draft State Highway Freight Plan, information on the major changes made to the Plan, and next steps regarding the freight planning process.

Background

The April 10, 2015 State Highway Freight Plan has been revised to address major comments from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and STAC members.

Details

Major changes to the Plan include:

- Reordering of sections, chapters and appendices for clarity.
- Added brief discussion of off-system freight, NHS, and intermodal connectors in Chapter I - Introduction
- Incorporated additional detail on plan integration in Chapter II - Purpose, and Chapter VII - Vision, Goals and Strategies.
- Added explanation of forthcoming performance measures as part of MAP-21 Rulemaking process.
- Inserted text on consistent regional themes in Chapter IV.
- Reorganized and updated sections of Chapter V for improved readability and pulled content from appendices to bring forward pertinent information, such as the Freight Corridor Selection Process, and Freight Supporting Infrastructure sections, and updated Freight Economic Trends and Emerging Challenges and Trends sections.
- Addition of Chapter VI - Freight Corridor Project Areas - added new tables that include project areas at the corridor level with information regarding needs/issues, Statewide Plan General Goal Area, and MAP-21 National Policy Goal Areas. An additional table includes potential improvement strategies to use that would improve freight movement.
- Addition of strategy in Chapter VII - Freight Trip Planning Resource.

The revised May 22, 2015 Draft State Highway Freight Plan will be available on May 22nd at:
<https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B31cv5WP0tJnfjdZVWprU0JPZVluY1JYZzlxawN4VXVpeExsY0k1TmZBQUZu dHhkWHBHeDQ&usp=sharing> (Copy and paste into browser or CTRL + Click to follow the link)

Comments can be submitted in two ways:

1. Submit comments prior to the May 29th STAC meeting to Jason Wallis via telephone at: 303-757-9425 or email at: jason.wallis@state.co.us
2. Bring comments with you to the May STAC meeting

Note: This Plan is not ready for public distribution and is a *Draft for Internal Review Only*.

Next Steps

The next steps for the freight planning process include:

State Highway Freight Plan - Phase I

- STAC members provide comments on the revised document.
- CDOT will revise the document based on comments received.
- STAC members will receive a copy of the finalized State Highway Freight Plan, prior to being submitted to FHWA for review and acceptance.

Integrated Freight Plan - Phase II

- June kickoff of Integrated Freight Plan development

